



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/728,385	12/05/2003	Kevin Smith	SYN-8311	8814
27316 7590 04/02/2007 GREGORY L. MAYBACK, P.A. 5722 S. FLAMINGO ROAD #232 FORT LAUDERDALE, FL 33330			EXAMINER WOO, JULIAN W	
			ART UNIT 3731	PAPER NUMBER
SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD OF RESPONSE		MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
3 MONTHS		04/02/2007	PAPER	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/728,385

Applicant(s)

SMITH ET AL.

Examiner

Julian W. Woo

Art Unit

3731

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 27 February 2007.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-69 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 50-65 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-49 and 66-69 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 3/17/04, 8/5/04, 1/5/05.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Election/Restrictions

1. Applicant's election of claims 1-49 and 66-69 in the reply filed on February 27, 2007 is acknowledged. Because applicant did not distinctly and specifically point out the supposed errors in the restriction requirement, the election has been treated as an election without traverse (MPEP § 818.03(a)).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

2. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

3. Claims 1-16, 18-28, 49, 66, 68, and 69 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Meeker (2,108,206). Meeker discloses, at least in the figures and in col. 1, line 51 to col. 2, line 41; a retractor including a rigid body (6); a retraction device for manipulating or grasping an object, where the device has a head (1 and 2 or 3) connected to the distal end of the body, an actuator (4c) movably disposed in the body; two, substantially rigid, arcuately-shaped needles (4a or 4b, where the needles are rigid enough to retain its shape and not buckle or bend when penetrating tissue); and a removable actuation device (9) connected to the proximal end of the body; where

Art Unit: 3731

the body has a longitudinal extent, where the head is connected removably or integrally formed (i.e., integrated) with the body; where the head defines openings (5), where the openings guide the needles in a direction substantially orthogonal to a movement direction of the actuator (see fig. 4), where the arcuate shape of the portion is no greater than a circle and greater than a semi-circle (around 4c), where the needles are pivotally connected to the actuator, where the actuation device has a rod (4) connected to the actuator, where the retractor includes proximal stop (6), where the actuation device has a locking device (12) or an overstroke preventor, where the actuation device is a one-handed actuation device, where the head has cam surfaces (5a) guiding the needles through the openings, where the head has an anchoring spike (2), where the actuation device selectively moves the actuator, and where the needles are sized to control penetration depth into tissues.

4. Claims 1, 15, and 17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Schmitt (3,754,555). Schmitt discloses, at least in the figure and in col. 2, line 47 to col. 3, line 47; a retractor including a body (12 and 14); a retraction device for manipulating or grasping an object, where the device has a head (16 and 18), an actuator (22) movably disposed in the head; substantially rigid needles (24) of a polymer (nylon) or steel (where the needles are rigid enough to retain its shape and not buckle or bend when penetrating tissue); and an actuation device (32) connected to the proximal end of the body, where the body includes a coil winding (12) and an outer jacket (14).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

6. Claims 29-42, 44-48 and 67 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Meeker (2,108,206) in view of Green (5,928,137). Meeker discloses the invention substantially as claimed. Meeker discloses a tissue retractor including body and a retraction device as claimed, where the needles are sizable to extend through tissues as claimed. However, Meeker does not disclose that the body and retraction device are sized to fit within a working channel of a flexible endoscope, nor does Meeker disclose that the retractor is combined with a flexible endoscope having at least one working channel for receiving the body and the retraction device. Green teaches, at least in figure 5 and 8 and in col. 1, lines 9-28 and col. 6, lines 49-65; a flexible endoscope having at least one working channel (e.g., 152) for receiving a long-

Art Unit: 3731

shafted endoscopic instrument, where the endoscope has application in various forms of endoscopy (including, e.g., hysteroscopy). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made, in view of Green, to size the body and retraction device of Meeker, so that the body and device can be accommodated by and combined with a flexible endoscope. A flexible endoscope with at least one working channel would not only allow access for Meeker's device to a surgical site, it would also allow diagnosis and imaging of the site, especially where the site has narrow, even tortuous confines.

7. Claims 29 and 43 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Schmitt (3,754,555) in view of Green (5,928,137). Schmitt discloses the invention substantially as claimed. Schmitt discloses a tissue retractor including body and a retraction device as claimed. However, Schmitt does not disclose that the body and retraction device are sized to fit within a working channel of a flexible endoscope, nor does Schmitt disclose that the retractor is combined with a flexible endoscope having at least one working channel for receiving the body and the retraction device. Green teaches, at least in figure 5 and 8 and in col. 1, lines 9-28 and col. 6, lines 49-65; a flexible endoscope having at least one working channel (e.g., 152) for receiving a long-shafted endoscopic instrument, where the endoscope has application in various forms of endoscopy (including, e.g., thoracoscopy). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made, in view of Green, to size the body and retraction device of Schmitt, so that the body and device can be accommodated by and combined with a flexible endoscope. A flexible endoscope with

Art Unit: 3731

at least one working channel would not only allow access for Schmitt's device to a surgical site, it would also allow diagnosis and imaging of the site, especially where the site has narrow confines.

Conclusion

8. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Rasor et al. (3,943,936), Schmitt (3,976,082), Thomas et al. (4,112,952), Dutcher et al. (5,179,962), Grieshaber et al. (5,716,328), Schroepel (5,871,532), Biggs et al. (6,599,311), Ginn (6,645,205), and McGuckin, Jr. et al. (2002/0151867) teach retractors.

9. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Julian W. Woo whose telephone number is (571) 272-4707. The examiner can normally be reached Mon.-Fri., 7:00 AM to 3:00 PM Eastern Time, alternate Fridays off.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Anh Tuan Nguyen can be reached on (571) 272-4963. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (571) 273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should

Application/Control Number: 10/728,385

Page 7

Art Unit: 3731

you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic
Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads "Julian W. Woo".

Julian W. Woo
Primary Examiner

March 27, 2007